



## **Texas Department of Insurance**

### **Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1645

518-804-4000 telephone • 512-804-4811 fax • [www.tdi.texas.gov](http://www.tdi.texas.gov)

## **MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**

### **GENERAL INFORMATION**

#### **Requestor Name and Address**

RENAISSANCE-DALLAS  
PO BOX 11527  
HOUSTON TX 77293

DWC Claim #:  
Injured Employee:  
Date of Injury:  
Employer Name:  
Insurance Carrier #:

#### **Respondent Name**

RICHARDSON ISD

#### **Carrier's Austin Representative Box**

Box Number 53

#### **MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-08-1013-01

#### **MFDR Received Date**

OCTOBER 12, 2007

### **REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "Our company has purchased national hospital payment data from 'Cleverly and Associates'; a national recognized company. This data is known as Med Par Data, based on this data, we have established a PAF or payment adjustment factor to be applied to our hospital specific Medicare OPPS reimbursement rate and determined this to be our interpretation and application of fair and reasonable... The PAF we have established is 250.00% of our hospital specific Medicare Outpatient Prospective Payment System reimbursement rate; this rate is consistent with most commercial and private payers with in this region."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$9,309.66

### **RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY**

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "Respondent paid the same rate that an inpatient facility would pay for a one-day stay for similar services. Requestor has failed to show that its fees or services should be billed more than what as inpatient facility would receive for similar services. Respondent received the above referenced bills and audited them accordingly. Respondent asserts it paid a fair and reasonable rate to the Requestor for the date-of-service. Respondent asserts that the Requestor should state the specific reasons it believe it is entitled, under the statutory standards, to specific amount of reimbursements it is seeking."

**Response Submitted by:** Harris & Harris, PO Box 91569, Austin, TX 78709

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
October 16, 2006	Outpatient Surgery	\$9,309.66	\$0.00

### **FINDINGS AND DECISION**

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and all applicable, adopted rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation.

#### **Background**

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 provides for fair and reasonable reimbursement of health care in the

absence of an applicable fee guideline.

3. Texas Labor Code §413.011 sets forth provisions regarding reimbursement policies and guidelines.
4. This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on October 12, 2007.
5. The services in dispute were reduced/denied by the respondent with the following reason codes:
  - W12 – Extent of injury. Not finally adjudicated.
  - 50 – These are non-covered services because this is not deemed a medical necessity by the payer.
  - W3 – Additional payment made on appeal/reconsideration.
  - W4 – No additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration.

## **Findings**

1. The insurance carrier reduced or denied disputed services with reason code W2 – “Extent of injury. Not finally adjudicated.” Review of the explanation of benefits with audit date April 23, 2007 finds that the carrier did not maintain this denial reason upon reconsideration. A Contested Case Hearing was held August 2, 2007; it was the decision of the Hearing Officer that the compensable extends to and includes progressive atelectasis, infiltrate, and effusion of the lungs, requiring surgery; and fractured rib, fractured elbow, tendon tear of the left should, and post traumatic stress disorder. Review of the explanation of benefits with an audit date of April 23, 2007 finds that the carrier did not maintain this denial reason upon reconsideration. Therefore, the services will be reviewed per applicable statutes and Division rules.
2. The carrier denied services using the denial code 50 - “These are non-covered services because this is not deemed a medical necessity by the payer.” Review of the explanation of benefits with audit date April 23, 2007 finds that the carrier did not maintain this denial reason upon reconsideration. Nor did the requestor submit documentation to support the position that the disputed service was unnecessary medical treatment. The Division therefore concludes that this denial reason is not supported. The services will be reviewed per applicable statutes and Division rules.
3. This dispute relates to services with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Texas Administrative Code §134.1, effective May 2, 2006, 31 *Texas Register* 3561, which requires that, in the absence of an applicable fee guideline, reimbursement for health care not provided through a workers’ compensation health care network shall be made in accordance with subsection §134.1(d) which states that “Fair and reasonable reimbursement: (1) is consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011; (2) ensures that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; and (3) is based on nationally recognized published studies, published Division medical dispute decisions, and values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments, if available.”
4. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual’s behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
5. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(E), effective December 31, 2006, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include “a copy of all applicable medical records specific to the dates of service in dispute.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided copies of all medical records pertinent to the services in dispute. Although the requestor did submit a copy of the operative report and post-operative care record, the requestor did not submit a copy of the anesthesia record or other pertinent medical records sufficient to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of §133.307(c)(2)(E).
6. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 *Texas Register* 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
  - The requestor’s position statement / rationale for increased reimbursement from the *Table of Disputed Services* asserts that “The PAF we have established is 250.00% of our hospital specific Medicare Outpatient Prospective Payment System reimbursement rate; this rate is consistent with most commercial and private payers with in this region.”
  - The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the PAF they have established is 250.00% of our hospital specific Medicare Outpatient Prospective Payment System reimbursement rate; this rate is consistent with most commercial and private payers with in this region.

- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that payment of the amount sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in this dispute.
- The requestor did not submit nationally recognized published studies or documentation of values assigned for services involving similar work and resource commitments to support the requested reimbursement.
- The requestor did not support that payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

### **Conclusion**

The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307. The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

### ***ORDER***

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the services in dispute.

### **Authorized Signature**

Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	September 27, 2012 Date
-----------	--	----------------------------

### ***YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL***

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. The party seeking review of the MDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with the Division. **Please include a copy of the *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision*** together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §148.3(c), including a **certificate of service demonstrating that the request has been sent to the other party**.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**